UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/777,588	02/11/2004	Yuri Itkis	087844.000025	4947
29747 GREENBERG	7590 09/18/200 TRAURIG	8	EXAMINER	
3773 HOWARI	O HUGHES PARKWA	7	HOEL, MATTHEW D	
SUITE 500 NORTH LAS VEGAS, NV 89169			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3714	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/18/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/777,588	ITKIS ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Matthew D. Hoel	3714
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	opears on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPUBLICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING IF Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perior Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statu Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mail earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION .136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tired will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the, cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. mely filed the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14. 2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) Th 3) Since this application is in condition for allow closed in accordance with the practice under	is action is non-final. ance except for formal matters, pro	
Disposition of Claims		
4) ☐ Claim(s) 80-86 is/are pending in the applicati 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrest is/are allowed. 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 80-86 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/ Application Papers 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examination is objected in the application is objected in	awn from consideration. /or election requirement.	
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) according to a deplicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct of the oath or declaration is objected to by the E	ccepted or b) objected to by the e drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se ction is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ejected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority document application from the International Bure. * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. nts have been received in Applicat ority documents have been receive au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National Stage
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	ate

Art Unit: 3714

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:
 - 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
 - 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
 - 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
 - 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
- 3. Claims 80 to 82 and 84 to 86 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Franchi (U.S. patent 5,770,533 A) in view of Zach (U.S. patent 5,954,582 A) and Angell, et al. (U.S. patent 6,702,672 B1).
- 4. As to Claim 80: '533 discloses all of the limitations of Claim 80, but lacks specificity as to an encryption key or random generation of an encryption key. '533 discloses all of the limitations of Clam 80, but lacks specificity as to. '533 teaches a self-service dispenser for dispensing multiple portable gaming devices (plural gaming devices 1203, 1503, Figs. 12 & 15; accessed by portable gaming devices 1600, 15:18-37) comprising: at least one self-service dispenser configured to accept consideration

Art Unit: 3714

and dispense at least one remote gaming device upon acceptance of the consideration; at least one dispenser being controlled by a central gaming controller (15:38-54, Figs. 2, 3, & 16); both the central gaming controller and the at least one gaming device configured to communicate with each other via two distinct bi-directional communication channels (15:23,24,29-31); the first of the two communication channels being secure and operating while the gaming device is located in, or in a close proximity to the dispenser (15:38-54); and the second of two communication channels being a remote communication channel and operating at least following the dispensing of the gaming device from the dispenser (RF, 15:23-25,29-31; used after release, 15:38-54). '672, however, teaches the gaming controller configured to transmit at least one data encryption key to the at least one gaming device via the first communication channel automatically and without involvement of personnel of a gaming establishment operating the dispenser, and the game controller and the at least one gaming device configured to utilize the at least one data encryption key to encrypt data communicated between the game controller and the at least one gaming device via the second communication channel, the data including at least one wagering request transmitted by the at least one gaming device to the game controller via the second communication channel, the data further including a random game outcome response to the wagering request transmitted by the game controller back to the at least one gaming device via the second communication channel (32, Fig. 2; 122, 124, Fig. 9; 4:33-40). One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to apply the encryption of '672 to the wagering system of '533. '672 is a wireless

Art Unit: 3714

wagering system (Abst.), in a similar manner to '533 (15:26-54). This modification would have the effect and advantage of encrypting the two-way radio transmissions to prevent interception and tampering with the gaming activity. This would protect both the casino and the wageror from fraudulent losses. '582, however, teaches at least one data encryption key utilizing a random number generating means (5:65-6:6) and the controller using a random number generating means separately and independently to generate each outcome in response to each wagering request (6:7-40). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have applied the random generation of the encryption key of '582 to the combination of '533 and '672. The random generation of the encryption key would have the effect and advantage of preventing an interfering party from guessing what the encryption key might be, since it would be randomly generated as opposed to being generated using a known algorithm.

- 5. As to Claim 81: '533 teaches a reader operable to read a player club card (2:37-54).
- 6. As to Claim 82: '533 teaches crediting a user's account upon a return of the gaming device to the dispenser (15:38-54).
- 7. As to Claim 84: '533 teaches the first bidirectional communication channel being a wired interface (15:38-54).
- 8. As to Claim 85: '533 teaches controlling the dispenser over a local area network Fig. 2).

Application/Control Number: 10/777,588

Page 5

Art Unit: 3714

9. As to Claim 86: '533 teaches a latch operable to secure the at least one gaming device in the dispenser, the latch configured to be release responsive to a signal generated by the game controller (16:10-14).

- 10. Claim 83 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over '533, '672, and '582 in view of Luciano, et al. (U.S. patent 6,500,067 B1).
- As to Claim 83: The combination of '533, '672, and '582 discloses all of the 11. limitations of Claim 83, but lacks specificity as to an employee terminal. '067, however, teaches a portable communication device configured to be operated by an employee of a gaming establishment, the portable communication device securely communicating gaming-relevant data with both the game controller and the at least one gaming device wherein the gaming-relevant data includes the at least one data encryption key (PT updates PAS D/B on cashout, CT verifies with PAS D/B upon redemption, 6:18-51; 7:61-8:14, 3:65-4:19, Clm. 6). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have applied the employee terminal of '067 to the combination of '533, '672, and '582. The wireless cashier terminal of '067 is analogous to the wireless wagering devices of '533 and '672 that can be checked out by the player. This modification would have the effect and advantage of allowing casino personnel to be dispatched on the casino floor to verify the player's wagers and winnings and issue the redemption vouchers for the player's winnings without requiring the player to report to a central point of sale in order to cash out his or her winnings upon completion of wagering.

Art Unit: 3714

Response to Arguments

12. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 to 79 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

- 13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Matthew D. Hoel whose telephone number is (571) 272-5961. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon. to Fri., 8:00 A.M. to 4:30 P.M.
- 14. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert E. Pezzuto can be reached on (571) 272-6996. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3714

15. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Matthew D. Hoel Patent Examiner AU 3714 /Robert E. Pezzuto/ Supervisory Patent Examiner Art Unit 3714

/M. D. H./ Examiner, Art Unit 3714